DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 110 HE 004 006

TITLE	Higher Education as a Field of Study.
INSTITUTION	Association of Professors of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	5 Mar 72
NOTE	59p.; Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Association of Professors of Higher Education, Chicago, March 5, 1972
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Bibliographies; *College Majors; Conference Reports; *Curriculum Development; *Departments; *Higher Education

ABSTRACT

This publication presents the proceedings of a meeting at which the discussions centered around higher education as a field of study. Five presentations are made in the document. The first is a review and interpretation of the literature surrounding the topic with a 53-item bibliography as a conclusion. The second offers insights into educational services for black students in American colleges and universities. The third section describes some of the programs currently offered in higher education and the fourth presents some reactions to these programs. The fifth and final section deals with the formative use of national guidelines in higher education departmental development. (HS)

ED 076110

HIGHER EDUCATION AS A FIELD OF STUDY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE004006

PROCEEDINGS of the FIRST ANNUAL MEETING of the ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSORS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

HIGHER EDUCATION

AS A

FIELD OF STUDY

PROCEEDINGS
of the
FIRST ANNUAL MEETING
of the
ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSORS
OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Chicago, Illinois
March 5, 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1. HIGHER EDUCATION AS A SPECIALIZED FIELD OF STUDY: A REVIEW AND INTERPRETATION OF THE LITERATURE -- Collins W. Burnett 1

2. EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR BLACK STUDENTS IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES -- Samuel D. Proctor 22

3. PROGRAMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION -- Lewis W. Mayhew. . . 35

4. REACTIONS TO PROGRAMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION -- Robert T. Alciatore. 41

5. DEPARTMENTAL DEVELOPMENT: THE FORMATIVE USE OF NATIONAL GUIDELINES -- John Bruce Francis 44

HIGHER EDUCATION AS A SPECIALIZED FIELD OF STUDY: A REVIEW AND INTERPRETATION OF THE LITERATURE*

Collins W. Burnett[1]
Professor of Higher Education
University of Kentucky

I. Introduction

Trying to decide whether higher education is a specialized field of study is like deciding whether some Latin American country is pro democracy or pro communism. It is easy to arrive at "yes" or "no" to either situation, depending on one's bias. However, in order to arrive at some valid and meaningful conclusion there must be an understanding of what is involved, a rationale, and some viable approach to information. The basic approach in this paper is to review the literature, arrive at tentative conclusions, and form recommendations.

Higher education refers to all post secondary educational programs of organized learning experiences which lead to a recognized degree. Both two-year and four-year colleges are included in this consideration. Although we are inclined to use "higher education" as a unit term to which many concepts and principles apply, the truth is that, other than the three primary elements in the academic community (students, faculty, and administrators), there is scarcely any universal dimension that can be identified except that of diversity. Under consideration is the gamut of small, large, liberal arts, state colleges, land grant universities, church related, private, co-educational, men's colleges, women's colleges, commuter type, residence type, single purpose, multi-purpose, professional schools, and graduate schools.

---

*Note. Presented here is a substantially condensed version (only about one-half) of the content of Dr. Burnett's original manuscript.

[1]The writer expresses his thanks to those who contributed leads and materials: Dr. John W. Gustad, Dr. Arthur Higgins, Dr. Earl J. McGrath, Dr. James L. Miller, Jr., Dr. J. A. Sorrells, Dr. Maurice Troyer, and Dr. Dyckman Vermilye. He also acknowledges the help and support of three doctoral students in the Department of Higher and Adult Education, University of Kentucky: Charles Ainsworth, Diane Maynard, and Samuel Rodgers.

According to the Saturday Review, there were 2,556 universities, colleges, and junior colleges in the United States in 1971. There were approximately 8,390,000 full-time and part-time students enrolled that year for credit toward degrees.

This 1971 magnitude of higher education is a far reach from the founding of Harvard in 1636, nearly 350 years ago. American higher education is something old, something borrowed, and something new. As Rudolph (1965) pointed out, Harvard did not just happen; it was planned. Not only was it planned for a purpose but as a model based on Oxford and Cambridge. It set the pattern for curriculum for nearly 200 years. The trivium with ancient languages became the basic program for the undergraduate area; advanced studies included the quadrivium with some mental philosophy, moral philosophy, and natural philosophy.

In the last half of the nineteenth century, as a result of the Morrill Act and the influence of the German universities, the true character of the American university appeared through the mist--a German graduate school and research center superimposed on an English college of undergraduate studies in arts and sciences with corridors leading to professional schools.

It remained for President Harper at the University of Chicago to add the new touch to the American structure of higher education by influencing the development of the first public junior college at Joliet, Illinois, 1902. The curious part about this beginning of the community college movement was that Harper conceived the plan originally as a group of satellite colleges (undergraduate level) to serve as feeders to the University of Chicago (Storr, 1966). Had it not been for Harper's father-in-law, Muskingum College, Harper's alma mater, might have joined other four-year institutions in becoming junior college satellites (Burnett, 1968).

In addition to the use of "higher education" as a generic term to include all post secondary education programs leading to recognized degrees in two-year and four-year colleges, the term has a specialized meaning. Higher Education (upper case) refers to a program of organized learning experiences leading to the master's or doctoral degree. In this sense it becomes a field of study, a scholarly inquiry, concerned with the phenomena of the behavioral interaction of students, faculty, and administrators within the context of a college or university environment, and the interrelationship of this environment with the larger society.

Higher Education in this meaning becomes a study of behavior, processes, and structures within the context of colleges and universities and the publics they serve. It is not only a complex area to be studied as it exists now (admissions, historical backgrounds, teaching-learning climate, evaluation

of students and faculty, organization, administration, financing, legal problems), but also an area about which pertinent questions can be raised. Is the curriculum implementing adequately the goals and purposes of the college? Is there consensus about these goals on the part of students, faculty, administrators, and alumni? To what extent are students different in values, attitudes, knowledge, and problem-solving ability at the end of two years or four years than they were as incoming freshmen? What data are needed to make intelligent decisions about various types of problems? How can a priority system be determined to relate to decision-making? To the extent that viable guidelines can be developed and applied to this area of study, will there be a basis for making a judgment as to whether or not Higher Education can be considered a specialized field of study?

II. Limitations of the Study

In this type of approach, which is non-statistical and subjective, one is always aware of two limitations that Walton and Kuethe (1963) have indicated. First, the investigator can never get away from himself, his bias, perception, and conceptual framework. Second, the use of language, communicating adequately, is a handicap, e.g., environmental press may have different meanings for different people. For this reason, the word "discipline" which has a flat, narrow, and absolute connotation has been avoided; the term "applied discipline" was also avoided because of the implied dualism of extrinsic vs. intrinsic values (Belth, 1969). Field of study is a more acceptable term; however, the term to be used in this paper is "specialized field of study" which moves the meaning close to that of discipline. The only hunch this writer has at this time is that Higher Education is a field of study; it may be emerging as a specialized field of study; it is not a discipline. No apology is intended because there may be other fields of study which have assumed the cloak of a discipline without being able to fly the banner of proof. As Brauner (1964) put it:

> The twentieth century has continued to deal with education summarily while taking precautions against the wholesale discussion of all of science and all of art [p. 232].

There is a third limitation. This area of study includes a great deal of folklore, myth, confusion, and misunderstanding. Some people who should know better still refer to Mark Hopkins on one end of the log and the student on the other as the ultimate guideline for effective teaching and learning. Some who should know better still consider the Berkely Revolution of 1964 as though this development were unique in the history of college student behavior. Hutchins (1936) in his usual puckish, challenging way commented that universities are engaged in three major activities: research, vocational certification, and

social accommodation. Anything that cannot be called teaching probably will be referred to as research. Hutchins stated:

> The most striking fact about the higher learning in America is the confusion that besets it. This confusion begins in the high school and continues to the loftiest levels of the university. The high school cannot make up its mind whether it is preparing students for life or college [p. 1].

There is still a fourth limitation to this study. Although there is more material available than one might think, much of it is in dissertations (some unpublished) or papers presented at meetings or in other fugitive literature. The usual sources were considered: Education Index, Dissertation Abstracts, ERIC, clues from friends, and a review of dozens of reports, papers, and unpublished studies. Some materials were identified but could not be obtained. Therefore, this review of the literature is not definitive.

III. Consideration of Study Questions

A. Is there a history of development in Higher Education with increasing status and recognition?

As far as a rationale for this study question is concerned, it seems logical to expect to find that any specialized field of study must have developed over a period of time rather than to have emerged suddenly from a corn field as an active volcano. If there has been such development, one should expect increasing status and recognition as has happened in psychology, history, sociology, and anthropology.

Higher Education like psychology has had a short history but a long past. Young (1952) pointed out that the first course in Higher Education was offered by G. Stanley Hall at Clark University in 1893. Later, another course entitled "Organization of Higher Education" was offered by Dean James, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1908-1909. Following these sporadic offerings, regular course work to provide professional preparation for careers in college administration was started in 1920 at the University of Chicago, Ohio State, and Teachers College, Columbia University.

No doubt in these early beginnings daring to offer courses in something called "Higher Education" must have taken some courage and a pioneer spirit. In some instances, such courses may have been embarrassing. Some Doubting Thomas likely said, "These courses in college administration are another example of how the university curriculum is becoming so watered down as to

be meaningless. Everyone knows that administrators like teachers are born and not made."

McGrath (1969) commented, "Until very recently the guild of practitioners in higher education could hardly satisfy the criteria used to determine whether a particular vocation could properly be classified as a profession" [p. 2]. He suggested that formerly those who wanted to develop expertise in teaching, administration, or research had to acquire these skills through an apprentice system in much the same way that one became a physician before medical schools were established.

Sagan (1968) in reviewing the literature concerning the history and development of Higher Education noted:

> It is surprising that higher education has waited so long to talk about itself. Perhaps it wished to wait until its impact was truly profound. Perhaps it wished to wait until its influence could be traced to almost every major advancement and to every portion of the national structure [pp. 1-2].

Ewing (1963) in a doctoral dissertation pointed out that graduate departments were increasing on an average of three to five per year. Ewing and Stickler (1964) stated:

> During the academic year 1962-63, a total of 87 institutions offered some 560 courses. Interest and activity in the discipline has increased at an accelerated pace as the need for better trained college teachers and administrators intensified in response to political, economic, and social forces. From about 1956 on, the appearance of institutes and centers for the study of higher education has added what may--at least in some instances--prove to be an important new agency for study and research in the field [p. 401].

Currie (1968) who reviewed graduate school catalogs for 1966-67 found that at least 106 universities were offering courses related to one or more of the sub-areas of Higher Education.

By 1968, there were approximately 335 faculty members teaching one or more courses in Higher Education, according to a list provided by the American Association for Higher Education (1968). The "List of Faculty Members Teaching Courses in Higher Education," which was distributed by AAHE (1971), included a total of 698 names, representing 166 colleges and universities. An analysis of this listing showed that each of

six institutions (Columbia, Penn State, Southern Illinois, University of California at Berkeley, Minnesota, and Wisconsin) listed 16 or more faculty teaching in Higher Education. The range was from one to 24.

Dibden (1965) established a rationale for formal programs in Higher Education: intellectual curiosity and educational maturity, the inherent and practical importance of higher learning (national security, cultural refinement), and the commitment of academic man. He also identified five problems which are characteristic of departments in this area, e.g., location within the institution. He indicated further some possible ways in which such a department could render important service to the university, e.g., cooperation with other departments in the development and evaluation of faculty.

Overholt (no date) in 1967 sent a survey instrument to 151 institutions to determine how many had a department, center or institute for studying Higher Education. Of the 121 replies, 31 had such a department, three were establishing one, 81 taught courses in this area, and 64 indicated a research center for the study of their own institution or Higher Education in general.

Rogers (1969) who wanted to document the incidence and scope of offerings in Higher Education sent a questionnaire to 180 institutions; 137 responses were included in this study. Of the 86 programs reported, including 53 that offered areas of major concentration at the doctoral level, 84 of them employed 468 faculty and offered 889 courses; 49 major programs had an enrollment of 2,174 graduate students; 44 minor programs enrolled 842 students at the doctoral level; 37 major programs awarded 316 doctorates; and 27 minor programs had 354 doctoral recipients in 1967-68.

Higgins (1971) in an unpublished manuscript provided some unique data to support the growing status and recognition of Higher Education as a field of study. He compared two studies undertaken by himself in 1966 and 1970. With the data received he was able to compare for the first time ratings of five doctoral areas in education, including Higher Education, at the 15 top ranked graduate schools in the United States. Higher Education had 114 faculty names submitted with a total of 57 doctoral programs, which was the smallest number in both categories for the five areas.

On a geographical basis, Higgins (1971) found that Higher Education programs were evenly distributed among the East (14), South (15), Midwest (15), and the West (13).

In comparing the results of the 1966 study in Higher Education with that of 1970, he found that the highest ratings in

the former were Berkeley, Michigan, Columbia, and Stanford; this order for 1970 was Michigan, Berkeley, Stanford, UCLA, and Columbia. Five programs which were not rated in the 1966 study were shown as "Good" in the 1970 study: Illinois, Minnesota, Southern California, Syracuse, and Wisconsin. Two programs, Ohio State and Pittsburgh, which were listed as "Good" in the 1966 study did not appear in the 1970 study.

Ewing and Stickler (1964) stated:

> Higher education has gained stature and is now taking its place alongside other recognized fields of education. National attention to higher education as a field of study is constantly increasing [p. 402].

Orr (1971) commented that recently at the University of Alabama the decision was reached that one option for meeting the foreign language requirement for the doctoral program was that of scheduling 15 semester hours in Higher Education. Fletcher (1972) added that in terms of a recent decision at the University of Nevada at Reno 17 semester hours in Higher Education may be used as one option for meeting the foreign language requirement. If this development were to become widespread, the ultimate would be attained in the status of this area of study in Higher Education.

B. What are the objectives and learning experiences of doctoral programs in Higher Education?

If this area is a specialized field of study, there should be specific objectives, related course or learning experiences, and the graduates from these programs should move into college and university positions doing what they have been prepared to do.

There is general confusion or at least lack of agreement about objectives even as there is diversity in admission requirements to graduate programs and degree titles (Burnett, 1969). Of course, in terms of all the change that is taking place in Higher Education, one should not think that this area is alone in having ambiguity and lack of agreement about objectives and programs. The Chronicle of Higher Education (1972) pointed out that at a recent meeting of the Modern Language Association there was strong indication that English as a discipline is in a process of marked change and that departments vary in objectives and programs; the total condition may no longer be healthy. Williams and Richman (1971) reported on a recent survey concerning the graduate preparation of the college professor of psychology. Although responding department chairmen indicated that teaching ability and research ability were important

competencies, they allocated only approximately one-fifth to one-sixth of the graduate student's training program to these competencies.

Overall, on the basis of checking statements and programs in graduate bulletins and talking with colleagues at professional meetings, three general career objectives emerge in graduate training programs: administration, teaching, and research. Some university programs in Higher Education indicate a principal function, e.g., the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan stated its goal to be the preparation of college and university administrators (1967). Some related functions were mentioned, for example, the preparation of administrators for non-institutional higher education agencies such as state planning and coordinating boards and the preparation of faculty members for university departments of Higher Education and centers for the study of Higher Education.

The University of Kentucky statement (1971) listed three purposes:

> The primary purpose of the Department of Higher and Adult Education at the University of Kentucky is the professional preparation of specialized personnel for careers in college administration. A second purpose is to serve as a support area for those who plan to become college teachers in the various academic disciplines. Both the two-year and the four-year college are included in these considerations. Although the Department does not prepare college teachers for the disciplines, it does offer a program of learning experiences which is designed to assist in the professional preparation and functioning of the college teacher.
>
> A third purpose is to prepare professors of Higher Education and professors of adult education who would teach and do research at major institutions offering graduate programs in Higher and Adult Education [pp. 2-3].

Some universities have developed specialized programs probably in response to needs within their respective states. For example, one would expect to find the objective and related program to prepare junior college administrators at one or more of the universities in such states as California, Florida, Michigan, and New York where there are large numbers of junior colleges. Likewise, there might be specialized preparation programs for junior college teachers in those same states.

Overholt (no date) with 121 responses from a total of 151 institutions found that 31 universities reported a Center, Institute, or Department of Higher Education; three were developing a graduate area; 81 taught courses in this area; and 64 reported a research center for the internal study of the institution or for general research in Higher Education. He found the following seven areas of course offerings:

Junior or community college
College and university administration
History, philosophy and issues in higher education
Preparation of teachers and curricula
Preparation of student personnel workers in higher education
Research in higher education
Miscellaneous

Rogers (1969) established somewhat different program areas on the basis of 69 institutions reporting major and minor programs and 84 institutions that reported courses in subspecialties. He showed the following:

Student personnel work (including administration)
Academic administration
Administration of business affairs
General administration
Higher education (general)
College teaching
Junior college (including administration)
Teacher education
Other (primarily adult education)

He formed several conclusions from this study. One, student personnel work was the greatest concern; 25 per cent of all the courses offered were in this area. Two, a sort of "adolescent stage of program development" was reflected by the lack of logic in the number of courses distributed among the subspecialties, e.g., 29 per cent (the largest group) of the courses were included in "Higher Education--general." Three, there was complete absence of an interdisciplinary approach; curriculum and faculty were based very largely in education. Four, although 86 institutions reported course offerings in Higher Education, to know how these courses are grouped in sequence or logic to form programs is only a wild guess.

In further analysis of his data, Rogers (1969) found that of the 53 institutions in this group, 52 reported having 360 faculty members or 77 per cent of the total reported by all respondents; 51 offered 745 courses (84 per cent of the total); 49 enrolled all of the 2,174 students reported as majors in the field; and 29 enrolled 645 (77 per cent) of the students reported with a minor. Also, of these 53 institutions, 37 reported all

316 of the doctorates awarded to those majoring in Higher Education, and 17 reported having awarded the doctorate to 165, or 47 per cent of the students reported as minors.

Waldron (1970) who surveyed doctoral programs in Higher Education in 40 universities found that such programs ranged in size from two to 26 courses with 12.9 courses as the average. The most common areas were General Higher Education and Student Personnel; Teacher Education and Business Affairs in Higher Education were least common.

Palinchak, et al., a group of doctoral candidates (1970) at Syracuse University, have done one of the most recent and comprehensive studies of graduate programs in Higher Education. Of the 275 questionnaires sent to faculty teaching courses in this area, there were 141 responses that could be tabulated. Among the findings were the following:

1. Approximately 86 per cent of the respondents indicated that they included administration, student personnel work, research, and college teaching in the field of Higher Education.

2. Even a higher percentage (97) included the study of both two-year and four-year institutions.

3. In terms of identifying a specific body of knowledge with this field, 79 per cent agreed but with reservations.

4. Most of the respondents (65 per cent) preferred course work at the doctoral level: fewer than one per cent indicated a preference for the master's level.

5. The Ph.D. degree was favored slightly over the Ed.D. degree; the Doctor of Arts degree seems to be gaining in acceptance.

6. In terms of what graduates do, the following careers were ranked from high to low: administrators, student personnel workers, researchers, faculty for Higher Education programs, and college teachers.

7. In terms of program elements, the greatest preference was shown for research problems, curriculum planning, internships, and student personnel laboratory/internships. There was considerable support for: Educational leadership, general administration, two-year colleges, statistics, educational philosophy, and educational psychology. Other elements such as law, finance and business affairs, historical backgrounds, adult/continuing education, computer/data processing, evaluation, and measurement, were shown to be somewhat useful.

In spite of the weaknesses and inadequacies in these training programs, McGrath (1969) stated:

> It is clear that a relatively new profession of higher education has come into being. To the extent that adequate resources are made available for this purpose, departments of higher education will produce the practitioners of higher education needed for the day by day operation of our colleges and universities. They will also train the large corps of investigators needed to appraise and test the practices of these institutions and to supply the corpus of reliable knowledge required for their efficient management. The social worth of the potential contribution of the members of the profession of higher education can hardly be in doubt. As this contribution becomes more widely known, the profession may be expected to expand rapidly in members and in the scope of its services [p. 13].

C. Is there a specialized vocabulary?

If there is a literature dealing with the study of Higher Education, there should be a specialized vocabulary to differentiate this field of study from others. The importance of vocabulary cannot be overstated. It is the key to principles, concepts, and content. Psychologists have demonstrated the importance of vocabulary in constructing intelligence, scholastic aptitude, and achievement tests. Unless a person is familiar with a field of knowledge, probably he will not know the terms or at least not be able to define them with preciseness.

Currie (1968) who designed an ingenious statistical approach for his doctoral dissertation at Ohio State, where he was one of my students, developed a final form of a vocabulary test with 107 items based on the 14 most important books in Higher Education as identified by 35 specialists in the field. His multiple choice items had five responses. He administered the test to four different sample groups of graduate students: Higher Education, elementary education, secondary education, and speech. (I have used this inventory several times on the first day of classes as an "eye-opener" technique with the invitation that any one who gets 100 of the items correct need not attend class the remainder of the semester. So far no one has qualified for this privilege.)

Currie found that the mean score for Higher Education majors was significantly higher (.05 level of significance)

than the mean scores for the other three groups of graduate students. He concluded that the literature in Higher Education does have a specialized vocabulary.

He concluded, also, that this special language was in a development stage when he stated:

> The uniqueness and denotative qualities of the language of Higher Education indicated, from the relatively small number of entries available for test purpose, that (1) the field, as presented through selected literature, is in early stages of technical development, or that (2) the selected literature tends to present very general descriptions and analyses of the field and therefore contains few denotative facts, theories, methodologies, and variables [p. 56].

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

The point was made earlier that the approach used in this analysis of the literature is largely subjective. What the writer concludes from this study may be a projection of his own bias.

First, an effort will be made to form some conclusions from the analyses which have been made. Second, some recommendations will be suggested.

The conclusions will be characterized in three categories: Paradise, Limbo, and Inferno. The findings that show clear, positive support will be placed in Paradise. Limbo will be the category for those areas that lack sufficient evidence to be placed in Paradise but are too well supported to be put in Inferno. Those that clearly lack supporting evidence will be placed in Inferno.

A. Although there has been a history of development with increasing status and recognition, one becomes very uneasy and insecure as he studies academic backgrounds of people who claim to be professors of Higher Education. There is no professional certification or admissions procedure to determine eligibility or qualifications. If one studies the most recent AAHE list of professors of Higher Education (1971), he finds 34 listings of people who are not even located at a college or university. Others who claim to qualify have come from a background of elementary or secondary school administration, have never held a college administrative position, and have never taken a professional course in Higher Education. No doubt this confusion was a part of the early development of disciplines such as history which had an official scholarly beginning during the

last part of the nineteenth century and psychology which began its recognition as a science in 1879 with Wundt at Leipzig, Germany. Perhaps a scholarly field develops more quickly as a discipline in the Arts College than in the College of Education where most doctoral programs in Higher Education are located.

Moreover, although some college presidents are very alert to appointing a dean of students or an academic vice president or a director of a new graduate program in Higher Education who has had professional preparation and experience, it is still a fact in too many instances one becomes anointed at the time of appointment regardless of qualifications.

It would be worthwhile, indeed, to study a sample of 300 people who list themselves as professors of Higher Education to determine the years of experience in college administration and the nature of their academic preparation.

This guideline must be placed in Limbo. With continued development and strengthening, it could easily move into Paradise within the next five to ten years. Higher Education in terms of this dimension is emerging into a specialized area of study but has not yet reached that status.

The following recommendation is made:

> A computerized data base needs to be established at AAHE headquarters. A carefully designed survey instrument requesting the following kinds of information can be mailed to the chairman or director of a center or area of Higher Education at every major institution:
>
> a. Master's or doctoral program or both
> b. Admissions requirements
> c. Curriculum both in Higher Education and related areas
> d. Objectives
> e. Number of current active graduate students
> f. Number of doctoral students graduated in the last three years
> g. Number of faculty on the budget of the department or center with a brief listing of degrees, major area of doctoral preparation, and college teaching and administrative experience
>
> This data base can be updated every five years.

B. In terms of evidence of societal need as well as concern, this area can be placed in Paradise. It is definitely positive. Recommendations:

1. AAHE needs to maintain and strengthen the present six Regional Committees to study social problems and needs and means by which Higher Education can relate them to graduate study in order to prepare effective persons in the sense of their having the proper competencies to perform their jobs well.

2. AAHE needs to form a Task Force or National Study Committee on the Interrelationship of Society and Higher Education in order to implement and coordinate the work of the committees mentioned above.

3. AAHE needs to prepare a position statement to indicate the role of Higher Education as a specialized field of study in the National Institute of Education (NIE).

C. As long as there is confusion and lack of agreement about objectives and graduate training programs, Higher Education will exist in Inferno. This area of concern has to be placed in the lowest category. Until an area of study can reach some agreement about objectives and learning experiences, evaluation as a professional area is impossible. Certainly Higher Education should not be involved in preparing public school administrators. What about the preparation of teachers for teacher education programs (public school) at college or university level? Recommendation:

AAHE should appoint a special study group or invite the Higher Education Colloquim or this Association of Professors of Higher Education to establish a set of objectives, competencies, and suggested learning experiences, which would become a viable guide for graduate programs in this field.

D. The problem of whether or not there is a recognized, viable literature is placed in Limbo, the middle category. Although the literature in Higher Education is extensive, many of those who are researching and publishing are converts from related disciplines. These people have not themselves been graduated from a professional doctoral program of Higher Education. Hopefully, the new generations of people in this field will emerge from such a professional preparation rather than moving from psychology, sociology, history, and English. Recommendations:

1. The Journal of Higher Education which at present is on a tenuous basis between AAHE and Ohio State University needs to be strengthened and its relationship to AAHE needs to be clarified. Otherwise, a new journal which is the sole and official

publication of AAHE should be developed.

2. As Currie (1968) found in examining selected literature about Higher Education, there is a need for writers to emphasize a base of philosophy, conceptualization, and theory development.

E. Yes, there is a specialized vocabulary which supports Higher Education as a specialized field of study; therefore, this guideline is placed in Paradise.

It does seem curious that Currie (1968) is the only researcher who has developed an experimental design with statistical treatment of data to determine the value of vocabulary as an indicator of the special nature of Higher Education. Although it is only one study, it seems sufficient to establish the point. Recommendation:

> In line with Currie's (1968) contention that this special language was in a developmental stage, his study should be replicated and updated. Perhaps a new type of vocabulary test can be developed.

F. As to whether there is a national organization(s) with a refereed journal(s), the appropriate category is Limbo. In a way, the damning condition for this finding is evidence of too much rather than too little. Not only is there a central organization which relates directly to the study of Higher Education (AAHE), but there are also many others, each with its separate national journal dealing with some phase of this field of study. AAHE has had an insecure development as an independent national organization and only since 1969 has it achieved this status. Moreover, the present title did not go into effect until 1967. Recommendations:

1. Every possible effort should be made to strengthen AAHE, financially and organizationally, to insure that it becomes the major professional organization concerned about the study of Higher Education.

2. The official journal of AAHE should be entirely controlled and sponsored by this national organization; moreover, it should be distributed as a part of the membership fee. The statement of ownership, for example, on page 796 of the December issue of the Journal of Higher Education (1971) presents all of the necessary details about ownership, location of the office of publication, and extent and nature of circulation; however, AAHE is not mentioned in any relationship.

3. Additional divisions (i.e., in addition to APHE) should be considered for inclusion in AAHE. Perhaps there should be one for college and university administrators. Another might be college student personnel. It is possible that other organizations would be justified in becoming a part of AAHE.

G. Supporting evidence which relates to studies of Higher Education at the national, regional, and state levels places it in Paradise. Recommendation:

The AAHE Task Force or National Study Committee referred to earlier should relate to and cooperate very closely with national, regional, and state groups involved in different aspects of the study of Higher Education. AAHE could become a strong educational and research resource, making its findings and expertise available to state and regional groups. Too much time is spent "discovering the wheel." For example, no state should start developing guidelines for a community college system because such are already available. No regional base need be developed for doing a projected enrollment study of colleges and universities; the base and the techniques have been established and proved.

V. Summary Statement

On the basis of all the limitations of this review and interpretation of the literature concerning Higher Education as a specialized field of study, the conclusion seems to be that it is still an emerging scholarly field but cannot at this time be considered a specialized field of study. However, with continued leadership and coordination on the part of AAHE it is entirely possible that in the next five years the three areas in Paradise can be strengthened; moreover, at least one or two of the areas now in Limbo can be clarified and strengthened and moved into Paradise. With a great deal of effort and reinforcement on a nation-wide basis, even the area concerning goals and objectives in Higher Education can be moved into Limbo or possibly even into Paradise.

References

1. Albright, Arnold D., "Changes in the Decade Ahead." A background report prepared for the Self-Study Committee of Twelve Planning for the Future of the University. November, 1970. University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

2. Anderson, G. L., "The New Breed of Administrator," in Higher Education Reflects on Itself and on the Larger Society, edited by G. Kerry Smith. Current Issues in Higher Education, Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education, 1966.

3. Belth, Marc, Education as a Discipline. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.

4. Berdahl, Robert O., Statewide Coordination of Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

5. Bolman, Frederick deW., "The Administrator as Leader and Statesman," in Stress and Campus Response, Current Issues in Higher Education, edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1968.

6. Brauner, Charles J., American Educational Theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

7. Brubacher, John S., "The Theory of Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 41, No. 2, February, 1970, pp. 98-115.

8. Burnett, Collins W., (edited by). The Community Junior College: An Annotated Bibliography. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education. The Ohio State University, 1968.

9. Burnett, Collins W., and Badger, Frank W., (edited by). The Learning Climate in the Liberal Arts College: An Annotated Bibliography. Charleston, West Virginia: Morris Harvey College, 1970.

10. Burnett, Collins W., "Report on Recent Statewide Studies and Surveys in the Southeastern Region." Unpublished paper, February 20, 1971.

11. Carmichael, Oliver C., The Changing Role of Higher Education. Kappa Delta Pi Lecture Series. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1949.

12. Current Documents in Higher Education: A Bibliography. Prepared by FRIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1970.

13. Currie, Andrew C., "An Investigation and Identification of Higher Education as a Graduate Field of Study and Research." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1968.

14. Dibden, Arthur J., "A Department of Higher Education: Problems and Prospects," Educational Record, Vol. 46, Summer, 1965, pp. 209-216.

15. Effective Use of Resources in State Higher Education. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1970.

16. Ewing, John C., "The Development and Current Status of Higher Education as a Field of Graduate Study and Research in American Universities." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1963.

17. Ewing, John C., and Stickler, W. Hugh, "Progress in the Development of Higher Education as a Field of Professional Graduate Study and Research," The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XV, December, 1964, pp. 397-403.

18. "Exploratory Development Basic to the Improvement of Preparatory Programs for Higher Education Administrators." Communication from the University Council on Educational Administration at Columbus, Ohio, to member institutions, May, 1971.

19. Fletcher, Dean (Dean, School of Allied Health, University of Nevada at Reno). Personal conversation, University of Kentucky campus, January 12, 1972.

20. Gustad, John W., and Burnett, Collins W., "Graduate Training in Higher Education." Unpublished paper developed at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, October, 1965.

21. Higgins, A. Stephen, Reflections of Quality. A Longitudinal Assessment of Doctoral Programs in Education. Unpublished manuscript, 1971.

22. Hutchins, Robert M., The Higher Learning in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

23. Journal of Higher Education. Vol. XLII, No. 9, December, 1971, p 796.

24. Kelsey, Roger R., A.A.H.E. Bibliography in Higher Education, 25th National Conference, Chicago, Illinois, 1970. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1970.

25. Kelsey, Roger R., A Bibliography on Higher Education. Prepared for the American Association for Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1969.

26. Lange, Carl J. "How ERIC Serves Higher Education." Educational Record, Vol. 51, Number 2, Spring, 1970, pp. 167-170.

27. "List of Faculty Members Teaching Courses in Higher Education." American Association for Higher Education, 1968.

28. "List of Faculty Members Teaching Courses in Higher Education," distributed by the American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D. C., November 4, 1971.

29. Marland, Sidney P., Jr., "A Strengthening Alliance." Paper presented at the Fifty-Fourth Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., October 7, 1971.

30. McFarlane, William H., and Wheeler, Charles L., Legal and Political Issues of State Aid for Private Higher Education. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1971.

31. McGrath, Earl J., "Higher Education as a Profession." Address presented for university administrators at the Colloquim on Higher Education, The American University of Beirut, Lebanon, July 24, 1969.

32. Millett, John D., Reconstruction of the University. A seminar presentation. The Institute for Research and Training in Higher Education. Cincinnati: The University of Cincinnati, 1968.

33. Orr, Paul (Professor of Education, University of Alabama). Personal conversation, University of Kentucky campus, December 15, 1971.

34. Overholt, William A., Higher Education as an Object of Study and a Subject for Teaching and Research in American Universities. Boston: Boston University. (No date of publication; study was initiated in the Summer of 1967).

35. Palinchak, Robert S., et al. Survey of Requirements for a Doctoral Program in the Field of Higher Education. ERIC, ED 041542, HE 001648. Syracuse University, May, 1970.

36. "Plenary Session Endorses Exploratory Development of Higher Education Project." UCEA Newsletter, Vol. XIII, No. 2, January, 1972, p. 5.

37. Publications Catalog, 1971-72. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

38. "Purposes and Objectives." Department of Higher and Adult Education, College of Education, University of Kentucky, January, 1971 (Mimeographed statement).

39. Report of the Task Force on Higher Education. A report prepared by the Task Force on Higher Education for the Board of Directors, National Education Association. Washington, D. C., June, 1968.

40. Report on Higher Education. Prepared for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at the request of former Secretary, Robert Finch. Frank Newman (Chairman). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

41. Rogers, James F., Higher Education as a Field of Study at the Doctoral Level. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, National Education Association, 1969.

42. Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1965.

43. Sagan, Edgar L., "The Emergence of Higher Education as a Field of Study." Unpublished paper, The Ohio State University, February 6, 1968.

44. Saturday Review, December 18, 1971, p 68.

45. Singer, Barry F., "Toward a Psychology of Science," American Psychologist, Vol. 26, No. 11, November, 1971, pp. 1010-1015.

46. Storr, Richard J., Harper's University. The Beginnings. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.

47. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Vol. VI, No. 14, January 10, 1972, pp. 1 and 5.

48. The Economics and Financing of Higher Education in the United States. A compendium of Papers. Submitted to the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

49. Waldron, Wilfred R., "A Survey of Doctoral Programs in Higher Education at Selected American Universities." A Summary of findings from doctoral dissertation with same title. May 5, 1970.

50. Walton, John, and Kuethe, James L., (edited by). The Discipline of Education. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1963.

51. Williams, Robert L., Legal Bases of Coordinating Boards of Higher Education in Thirty-Nine States. Chicago: The Council of State Governments, 1967.

52. Williams, John E., and Richman, Charles L., "The Graduate Preparation of the College Professor of Psychology," American Psychologist, Vol. 26, No. 11, November, 1971, pp. 1000-1009.

53. Young, Burns B., "The Rise and Development of Instructional Courses in Higher Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, 1952.

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR BLACK STUDENTS IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES*

Samuel D. Proctor
Professor of Education
Rutgers University

At the moment this country is experiencing one of the most subtle but one of the most telling pangs of revolution that I think could be experienced. In 1960 we used the figure of 250,000 black students in the colleges in the South and 125,000 scattered across the North. We are talking now about 600,000, I've heard 750,000, but what we do know is that we're dealing with a magnitude of something like three or four times the number of black students we had in 1960.

If I told you what the multiplier was it would be misleading because you wouldn't think that we would have to wait four or five generations for real change. But I take the risk anyway of telling you the results of having a black person finish college. And I caution you that this is not my plan for salvation. I just want to tell you that I have a deceased grandmother who finished Hampton Institute in 1882. She had 60 grandchildren and great grandchildren who either finished college or are in college right now; that's 60 in three generations. I am one of the grandchildren and I have four children, two boys, one in Rutgers graduate school and one here in graduate school at the University of Chicago. That's why I need to take an offering when I leave here to get back home! I have a brother who is in dentistry, who's got four children: one daughter who's working at Albany State, another son who's a graduate of Hampton. And I could go on. And in my own parental family of five children, four boys and a girl, each one has at least two children out of college and one or two on the way. That's the kind of multiplier you get when you have one grandmother who finished college.

But whenever you cite this to young blacks they get shaken because they think in terms of a black person today having a Ph.D. and not being able, for example, to be a Dean or a President or a Department Chairman. Nevertheless, the point is that

---

*Note. Dr. Proctor spoke extemporaneously. Presented here is a transcribed and edited version of his address as recorded on tape.

when there is a sufficient saturation and when opportunities expand I think we will see one of the really quantum leaps in terms of opportunity for black people. So when I look at the growth in numbers, I am astounded at what this promises for the very near future.

We have another development. While we're debating about black colleges in the South and while the states are in a quandry about what to do about the black colleges, we're building new black colleges all over the North. Essex County College is going to be a black college in New Jersey--there is no question about that--and they will have a token representation of white students. Martha Bucks University right here is going to be a black school with a token representation of whites. Evers College in Brooklyn is a new black college. Federal City College is another new black college in Washington, D. C.; and then if you look at schools like Wayne County Junior College in Detroit, in just an amount of time that'll be predominantly black. In other words, wherever there is an urban center with a black population of 75 to 80 per cent, and that's going to be like 10 major urban centers in America, the higher education that goes on in that urban center will be largely in the interests of black people. This is brand new, very new.

I talked with a lady the other day who is about my age. She went to Jersey City State College and finished in the late 30's, which was around the beginning of World War II. At that time they had four black students in Jersey City State College. When I go on that campus right now it seems to me that about every other student is black.

At St. Peter's College in Jersey City they didn't take blacks 20 years ago except for some big lawyer's son or some mortician's son or some fair-skinned black whom no one would ever identify. They could go but it just was not kosher to have a black in St. Peter's College. However, the other day I went over there to lecture at the black student union.

I illustrate how this growth among black students has emerged in the urban centers, but this says nothing about my own Rutgers University. The New Brunswick campus was practically lily-white ten years ago--four or five black students were all they had.

When I went to graduate school at Yale in 1945, there were four black students at Yale and every day in Hopkins House (Room 125) we would gather after the affairs of the day: that was our Black Student Union. We reviewed everything we saw right from the window, even the firefighters and what things some professors said; we would review that and editorialize the whole thing. It was just our ego stretched by nurturing well enough.

We were just like four little puppets caught in a snow storm up there in New Haven in 1945, but today it's not four, it's 400 blacks in the undergraduate school at Yale to say nothing of those in the graduate schools.

So this is the phenomenon that you have and it's more than just a matter of getting used to something new and different. We're having a revolution in higher education that's going to have a very serious manifestation on the society at large.

Now the first question is, how do we serve this new population? We have to understand that these black students, despite their rhetoric, want the same thing out of college that everybody else wants out of college. I was talking with some Rutgers (New Jersey) Equal Opportunity Students the day before yesterday. They had a convention and massed all of the black students. I wanted to go over there to see what was happening. But as they polled the dukes they called me about 36 hours before the convention and said, "Stop the clock. Would you speak to us?" They just called me up, but that's part of their strategy. The strategy is to let you know as a black man that you belong to them and all this kind belongs to them. You have to accept the strategy; you get sudden and quick notice. I said, "Of course, I'll be there." Well, I was a little bit nervous because I don't have a beard and I don't have a natural Afro hairdo. I wear a tie, and some of these things I do very deliberately in order to compel dialogue and it works out very well. When I stop a student on the campus and say, "What do you say, Tiger?", he turns right away and says "What's happening, baby?" He sees my tie, no beard, and he draws certain conclusions. We have prepared a lot of symbols which have a specific significance. He says, "Where's your office anyway?" He thinks it's in a cage somewhere. The office is on the third floor in the School of Education. He comes back. Now the traffic of people is in and out of my office all the time because they just don't believe that the conversation we have together is natural and normal. There is something awkward about this, but they keep coming back.

Dean Schwebel was sitting beside me when we were going through this thing. He said, "What do you want to talk about?" I said, "Well, let me tell you something else. You can't talk to these people in the kind of forensic and argumentative fashion in which you give speeches ordinarily. You've got to be spontaneous with them because they have a sense for the earnestness of the spontaneous, extemporaneous kind of dialogue. You just have to do it." I said that they view television and the talk shows are so extemporaneous that it is apparent they are spontaneous. If you are too formal to them you're not saying what you really mean. He said, "What are you going to do?" I said, "Well, I've got to set this up with some antithesis of my thesis and some relevant questions." He said, "What's your

antithesis going to be?" Your antithesis is going to be higher education--all the problems. "What's your thesis going to be?" If the problems are ever solved they'll be solved by educated people. He said, "Ah." So I went right down that line. Then I said, "Here is the kind of education you're going to have to have to solve the problems that affect the black people." Then I ran through that 1, 2, 3, a, b, c. You'd be surprised at where they burst out with applause. Scared me to death. It really did. I made one remark halfway through that speech. I said, "Brothers and sisters, I want to tell you something. When I go through the Student Union at Newark State, Patterson State, and Jersey City State and see 24 black students playing cards at noontime I go in the men's room and cry." They roared with approval at that. It was thunderous. It was just like they were waiting for somebody to say that and to say it with some degree of authority.

I ran into another thing. I was telling about an operation that I had been a part of. One of my nephews had a brain tumor removed, and I was telling them about the eight men who performed the operation--what kind of training they had, what it took to get that surgical skill. Here was a young black boy who finished Hampton Institute having a tumor removed from the front of the cranium--a tumor that had blinded him and had knocked out his memory. He was almost like a jelly fish and when they removed the tumor from off those nerves, he recovered perfectly. Miracle, just like a miracle. And I was saying to those black students that it annoyed me when I saw these eight men come out of that room and all eight of them were white--Irish, Catholic, Jewish. I left that room feeling that my job wasn't finished until I could see eight men leave a room where a tumor had been removed from a black boy's cranium and have two black men in that group of eight doctors. That's my target. They just roared with applause.

I had the deepest conviction that these students despite their rhetoric had the kinds of goals, career goals, aspirations for their lives that all other students have. But accompanying these career goals is a certain social acumen that leaves white folk cold because they don't understand it for the most part; social acumen that we need to be far more aware of. When you compare that with my generation, when I was in college, we were taught that there was a certain kind of a survival kit that you have to have to make it as a Negro in the Negro world. And they called it the Negro world. (We just started saying blacks in the last 24 months. Kind of hard being a Negro for 48 years and then becoming black overnight!) When I was a student, we thought about being the principal of George Washington Carver Heights School or the Dean of Virginia Union University. All this was within the framework of a tidy black world. A black Ph.D. in mathematics from Cornell back in the 30's could only go to a black college. He couldn't go to VPI to

teach with a Ph.D. from Cornell; he couldn't go to the University of Virginia to teach. The Christian Colleges had said, in effect, "We want our freedom from legislative control and direction, freedom so we can be as racist as we want to be, freedom to be as anti-Christian as it is possible to be." None of the private colleges moved until the state colleges were compelled to move by law, which is one of the saddest commentaries on higher education that I know of. Schools like the University of Pittsburgh, Wake Forest, and Davidson--all of these fine institutions made all these protestations in the name of Christ but did nothing until black folk went to court and sued to get into Chapel Hill or State College and then they came along with a very reluctant reaction to that sort of thing.

But all of us lived and talked in terms of a black world. Well, I want to tell you something. I was comfortable and satisfying. I didn't have to compete with people who came out of Petersburg or Thomas Jefferson High School. I only competed with people who finished George Washington Carver and that was a small world. You had a comfortable kind of competition with which you could cope. And it meant that your ego strength was intact. When you went off to graduate school you felt good; you were well equipped because you had succeeded in a world that was manageable.

But now these black students who turn up on campuses like Wayne State or at your campuses are aware of the fact that that tidy Negro world has been dismantled. As a matter of fact one reason why they go through so much trauma, trying to reconstruct an act that can pass, is to capture once again the kind of emotional comfort that their fathers had living in an altogether black world. We've got them in a kind of no man's land. They're in between somewhere.

And what do you think that does to a middle class kid? Now just picture a girl coming out of a middle class home of a bigshot lawyer in Jersey City who makes $60,000 or $70,000 a year. Here his daughter has had three bathrooms in the house, she takes her French poodle to dog shows, she eats well and there's a maid in the house, she goes to camp in the summer time, and her daddy goes to the islands in the winter time. All of a sudden she comes to Douglas College and she's a second class citizen. Do you think that's not going to make her drop her tray or throw darts at the old president's picture on the wall? That's enough to drive you out of your mind. You attain status in one world and then all of a sudden somebody drops you in another world in which all of that is suddenly removed.

D. C. Wright's daughter--I saw her walking across the campus of Douglas the other day with her dungarees and her books--no dates, no boyfriends, all these big formal events and she

doesn't get invited. Her daddy was one of the biggest people in Montclair, New Jersey. He is Pastor of the Union Baptist Church and everytime they had a hot dog feast or fish fry or turkey trot or anything else Dr. D. C. Wright had to give the invocation. Now his daughter is walking across Douglas College overlooked, a nothing. Just multiply that into the thousands and then you'll see what I'm talking about.

I went to Iowa State to lecture to a conference that the University had celebrating its 100th anniversary. When I got there the black students said, "You mean you've come all the way out here to talk to all these honkies and not talk to us?" I said I would meet with them and they said, "You be at our place tonight at eight o'clock." I said, "I'll be there." When I arrived they were lying around on the floor. First of all they had to go through this emotional thing of letting me know that they weren't carried away with my presence. They didn't even look at me until I began to talk loud, and then they rolled over slowly. I said, "I know why you're treating me so cool and funny, because you're lost up here in Iowa State. Everything is snow white up here: white folks even whiter than they are down in Virginia. And I want to tell you something. There's only one kind of aristocracy open to you here. The racial aristocracy is closed. You're not going to get white that fast. The monied aristocracy you can't overcome, because that takes stealing over three or four generations. But, there's an aristocracy waiting for you in that library for which there's no competition; the aristocracy of the intellect." They can't fight that. Then I asked them, "What was your grade point average? What did you make in qualitative analysis? What did you make in Calculus?" Then I continued preaching and talking with them about what it takes.

But you can go only so far as a college student. If the whole environment around that situation is not supportive and conducive to what I've said to them and what other black people say to them they have a very uncomfortable existence. And they almost regret they didn't go to Morehouse College or to A & T College in North Carolina because they find a completely inhospitable situation.

And that's the thing that concerns me. How do we recognize the fact that they know they're in a socially awkward situation, that they know they're not really welcome? And how do we minister to the notion that they're in college for the same reason that every other young person is in college--upward mobility, the development of skills, the fulfillment of some kind of life's aspiration and certainly to place a new worth on whatever skills and talents that God has given them?

Because of the history of secondary education for black people in this country and because of the culture of poverty

with which many black people grow up, some special effort has to be made. I'll mention these quickly and then I'll talk about what I think a group of professors of higher education ought to be thinking about and trying to prepare people to meet this situation.

The special efforts have to do first of all with admissions. There are two ways to get around the problem of a great many black people with capacity. I'm not talking about idiots; I'm talking about people with capacity. There are two ways of facing the problem of getting them into the pipe-line of higher education. One way is to be serious about it, and really go out and look for those black people whom you believe can make it whether they're poor or not: then find the money to sustain them. If you earnestly believe that higher education is an important social change agent, you won't want to put in people who will be flunking out. The other way is to get yourself a feed wagon and back it up to a corner somewhere and say, "Ya'll come!" Unfortunately, some fine universities have taken the second course and I think almost took the second course maliciously. It's almost like busing, you know. Some people went about busing so ridiculously that it makes the whole thing look foolish. But when I go to some campuses and see some of the people that they admitted to college--black or white, green or blue--it seems to me that they didn't have enough interest in it to want to do the thing honestly.

In addition, when I see some of the people that they hired to work with these students, I feel like weeping over the whole situation. I won't recall the names of any schools, but I have seen this happen at close range in many places. Some people become so intimidated by black students that they just told the students, "You go off and find yourself a counselor and we'll pay," as though they don't want to be bothered by the whole mess. "Go find yourself a remedial developmental English teacher and we'll pay; you choose him." I've been in a room where they have been sitting around interviewing people and it was the most ridiculous kind of thing. I'm not saying students shouldn't be a part of the process. What I am saying is that the college ought to be earnest enough about this problem to make sure that they will really help black students if they're going to get into developmental studies and into flexible admissions. Flexible admissions policies do not mean that you admit every moron that you run into, everybody who writes a letter, everybody who calls, or those who say, "I've got a friend who would like to be here too." This Equal Opportunity money, $1200 a year, isn't bad for anybody in these Nixon days. The point is that this is not human and is not the situation we want.

I remember when Dean Weigel sat across from me at the table to talk about my admission to Yale and said, "This new

thing, the Graduate Record Examination, is an important thing here at Yale." He said, "Mr. Proctor, your score is one of the strangest ones that I have seen. Verbally, you're way above the top for people from your region, and in the fine arts, you're way below the bottom--we can't find you. In chemistry and the sciences you come out way below but in the verbal and the social sciences very high." I said, "We talk about social conditions all the time. We discuss who the presidents were and what they've done. We know what Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson did, or the black people like Monroe Trotter, because we've been socially and politically oriented. Next, as students we didn't have any money, so we talked all the time and we've developed high verbal skills. Moreover, we had to take those languages by a lot of defunct preachers who knew Latin and Greek. Those classes got filled up quickly and if you know a lot of Latin and Greek and if you know these Latin and Greek derivatives, you can use words." So I explained that was why my score looked the way it looked. He said, "Well, I'll tell you what I'm going to do. I'm going to call up some people who know your college and have them call people at your college to see if you can do the work here, and we're going to forget this record. I'd rather know from somebody what your intentions are and what your capacity is." Now that's how he went about it--and that was 20 or 30 years ago. That's talking about open enrollments and flexible admissions. This was Dean Luther Weigel at Yale University in 1945. He put aside all of the traditional cut-off points. Later on he and I talked about it. He said, "I've heard you describe what it was like growing up as a Negro boy in Norfolk, Virginia. We just don't have any questions on that test to get answers like we would like to have from you. . ."

I had occasion the other day to recite that story to a friend of mine in Rutgers who was criticizing a new program because they didn't have a cut-off point on the Graduate Record Examination. He really got me upset because he's a professor of reading and a great specialist in reading. Reading is world-wide and he is going to talk about what black people ought to know and be and have in order to come to a special program at Rutgers. Then he had the audacity to say there ought to be a cut-off point on the Graduate Record Examination and a cut-off point on another kind of a test that he was going to give. And I asked him, "Are these the only things you want to know about a person coming into this program?" He said, "What else is there worth knowing about a person?" Whether the student had the guts to grow up when he found out that he was black in Birmingham 22 years ago, that's what the professor ought to know. Because I think if you, professor, were born black in Birmingham 22 years ago, you wouldn't be around here today. That kind of question isn't on there.

You see when I talk with a student about his capacity to do graduate study and some of the aspects of his intellectual

behavior, I'm interested in other things as well as the cognitive aspects because some of these "other things" can be very influential. I want to know where did he come from? And how did he find out about college and then get here to Rutgers University?

For a fellow like me, it didn't take very much. If you grow up in a home where there is this grandmother requiring you not to split verbs, requiring you not to split infinitives, requiring you to align your pronouns with antecedents and verbs with the subjects, you are prepared for college. Everybody says you have to go to somebody's college or Sunday morning you have to go to Sunday School--go to Sunday School or drink a 15¢ bottle of Castor Oil. When you have grown up in a home like that college is as natural to you as daybreak.

But one of my roommates in college, John, had a father who was blind in one eye and worked sometimes as a longshoreman and sometimes doing odd jobs. His mother was a diabetic and worked as a domestic for seven bucks a week. Johnny would get up in the morning at Virginia Union, go outside with a wheelbarrow and put ice in all the coolers because we didn't have electric coolers. He would go to school all day, then go out and punt this football, then come home and change his clothes and get back in the dining hall to do his other work. I can see him right now sitting on the side of the bed with one leg out of his football pants, other leg in, just exhausted, lying there, with a mother at home earning seven bucks a week, a diabetic, and his father walking around doing odd jobs with one eye. Johnny would take his scholarship money and pay his expenses. Then he would send the ice hauling job pay-check home, 15 bucks a month, to help take care of his mother and father. Years later I went to Crestwood and saw him as a principal of an elementary school, helping kids.

What examinations could test that kind of tenacity? It seems that Americans ought to be proud that there are such people left who can fight circumstances. The pioneer spirit is still very strong in these people. Here is the kid who comes out of a welfare family of 11 children. Every one of them has a different name, but you hear one of them saying he wants to be a microbiologist. Whatever told him he ought to be a microbiologist? There wasn't a black microbiologist in sight, yet he thought this up all by himself: that's what he wants to be. Well, I say all this kind of activity needs to be supported by people who understand what admissions ought to be like.

And it says something about the curriculum. Now these students begin yelling and screaming about black studies, some of the things they want in the name of black studies. You and I understand that they just weren't aware of what they were asking the university to do in asking for some new kind of

courses. In a way, I think they had tongue in cheek. I had black studies in college because it was required. We had a big red book in 1941, the Negro Caravan, Negro literature, Negro history, but most people didn't know that. Black students who are at Rutgers University, Jersey City, Newark and places like that today know nothing about this. They try to leap back beyond the slave and reconstruction era to pick up a relationship with Africa because they want something to tie into. It is very unfortunate that, noble as this enterprise is, I don't think they're going to live long enough to complete it. It turned out to be rather a fanciful kind of thing. I don't think they're going to find what they are looking for. But we owe it to them somewhere in the Psychology Department to have a course that deals with the whole problem of intelligence quotients and things of that nature and all of the learning disabilities that go along with the environment of poverty. We owe it to them in the history class to get a black perspective on the reconstruction. We owe it to them in the study of imperialism to find out how the slave institution came into being. And you could go on and on and on. They should understand what literature of protest was in the black community. They need to know where the black people were in the 1930's. Had they all rolled over for dead or was anything going on?

And if I had a choice of courses, I would have them study the major court decisions that affected our people. Every time I tell some of my students that I knew people who got fired for suing for equal salaries in 1935 and 1937, they're shocked. They thought all those black people were sitting around strumming banjos, waiting on tables, and being happy and grinning at white folks. They didn't know. Rupert Picott lost his job as a principal in Huntington Elementary School in Newport News for suing for equal pay. There were more than 35 court cases beginning in 1935 and all the way up to 1954--49 victories. Jack Greenberg's book will tell you all about them. They need to know that, because then they won't have the notion that nothing happened before 1960. In fact, all this happened in the courts before 1960.

So the curriculum has to reflect this background and so do student services. I have a friend, a vice president of a fine state university; I won't name the State, but he is Vice President for Student Services. The first thing he discovered was 300 black students living in one end of one dormitory, and nobody was able to move them. He went to them and said, "Listen, brothers and sisters, you know this is against the law. We can't have this. The President says you have to move out." "Go tell the President to come up here and tell us," was the reply. Now what happened was that some soft-headed administrator capitulated before this kind of thing. And who can then undo a situation with 300 black students living in one end of a dormitory? I think that student services, i.e., people who are

in charge of this operation, will have to recognize that the black students as well as white students need to be protected from bad decisions. The end of in loco parentis does not mean that we permit students to do anything they want to do to destroy their college experience, as so many people have allowed black students to destroy their college experience. At one university that I know they gave the students a black house, but when the students found out that the black house was not for all black students but just some black students, they had no recourse. They went to the university officials and said, "We can't use it, the music is loud, the smoke is so thick we can't cut through it, and there's no opportunity to sit around and talk and debate; you have to run out if you say the wrong thing." The university treated them as though they were all of one kind and said, "You black folk just have to go away. Leave us alone. We gave you a black house. You've got it; now we can't come over there and run it for you. This is really betraying a trust." If I had my son in a college and they treated him like that I would be very unhappy about it. I would not want my son victimized by almost any kind of political movement that swept through the campus. I think that student services will have to be repaired.

Therefore, what would I suggest that would be a good menu, a good course of action for departments of higher education? One thing is this. You have almost no excuse for not allowing your students to take a course which deals deliberately with the black experience in America. And I'm not talking about sending somebody over to take some undergraduate course in black history. If you have a master's or a doctor's program in higher education you ought to organize a course having to do with issues in Afro-American experience or issues in Afro-American education. And this doesn't have to be a course in history. What would be the scheme for such a course? You would ask yourself this question: what are the 15 or 16 most important developments in the experience of black people that have to do with education? What would be the 15 most important questions that have to do with the experience of black people that relate directly to education? A lot of people have little or no awareness of what the Land-Grant movement did and how it developed. How many of you could talk intelligently about the Freedman's Bureau and why it came to such an early demise? Who knows who was around when the public school laws were written and what part black people played in the writing of public school laws within our various states? Who knows what the State Constitutions did to black educational opportunities? There are about 15 questions like these that would bring us right straight to the issues that we are dealing with today. I would suggest that that would be one of the first and most constructive things that we could do.

Second, we need to provide our students with some opportunity to be in contact with the whole spectrum of the black community. I'm just sick and tired of meeting educated white people who think that all black folk are on dope or on relief or half-way in jail or out of jail or who have no appreciation for what the middle class black community has gone through and what it has paid. If you don't live around middle class black people and have never had contact with them, don't go to church with them, don't go to college with them, you have no perception of this consideration whatsoever. That allows you to treat me and other black middle class people with the same kind of cavalier racial response, because you have never had a chance to meet black people who represent the middle class. Many students in my classes talk about writing a term paper about the black community. I tell them I'll assign them to go to a black church in New Jersey for four Sundays in a row. Indeed I do. That's the only place you'll see black people doing their thing without white folks looking. You go to Union Baptist Church in East Orange, go up to St. Mark's Church in Harlem. When you go to St. Mark's Church in Harlem, you're going to hear some of the greatest music you ever heard and one of the most intelligent preachers you ever heard. The people who come to that church own their homes and send their children to college. They're not screaming and yelling and nobody's fainting and carrying on. They act just like the finest kind of people you know. But you would never meet them. In America there's no opportunity for middle-class white folk to meet middle-class black folk and all the propaganda through the media is introducing the black belligerents to the white majority.

The chance that Dr. Ida Long Rogers knows me is purely accidental. In Nashville, Tennessee, we would have no chance to meet. She lives on one side of town, all black folk on the other side. The faculty of Peabody College are scared to move between these two communities and so she would have no opportunity to meet me. But the Danforth Foundation sets up conferences and then black and white people get a chance to meet and act civilized.

Racism in this country has separated us. Therefore, if you want to train a higher education specialist and are going to deal with his problems, you've got to set up an artificial situation in which you can meet black people who represent the whole spectrum and try to work shoulder to shoulder. You need to work with some black people who are engaged in the same enterprise, and you've got to have some black people on your faculty interpreting this situation to you on a day-by-day basis. When I was asked to come to Rutgers, my potential employer said, "If you don't have other plans, I want you to be there. Not only do I want you to come to Rutgers, but I think that every university ought to have a black person like you to support the whole system. If once I get you in there I can walk off and forget it."

Now, when I got to Rutgers, the first thing I did was look around and find out how few experimental things were going on in the interest of black people. I began to write and work, and do you know in 36 months--and this isn't trying to boast; I'm telling you what the efficacy of this strategy is--I have over 38 graduate students on Federal grants under my direction. So the salary Rutgers is paying me is reimbursed by these Federal grants. I really work for Rutgers for nothing! Here I've got 38 black people doing graduate study on Federal grants. When you bring in one person who will hustle and will assert himself and will relate more to the situation, then he becomes catalytic for the whole thing. And if you're running the graduate school program in higher education and you have nothing but white people around and you're going to talk about serving black people, that's a contradiction. You've got to have some black people operating in the system. And I'm not talking about deans only. I'm talking about black people with degrees and experience who are eligible for high faculty rank and who can be catalytic in the situation.

PROGRAMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Lewis B. Mayhew
Professor of Education
Stanford University

That there is an emerging scholarly domain called generally the field of higher education there can be no doubt. There are somewhere between four and eight hundred individuals in the United States and Canada who call themselves Professors of Higher Education and who offer a variety of courses dealing with many aspects of that subject. These courses range from those dealing with curriculum and instruction in junior colleges [designed to prepare teachers for those institutions] to courses on the history of American higher education on to courses seeking to elucidate and elaborate the relationships between higher education and contemporary society. There are several centers located in universities concentrating on research about many facets of higher education, ranging from studies of distinctive types of institutions to studies of institutional press to investigations of modes of teaching in higher education. There is an expanding body of literature about higher education which, taken totally, could very likely establish at least the major parameters of this growing scholarly field. Just to illustrate, the titles of a random selection of books published in 1971 indicate something of the scope of this field. The Study of Religion in Colleges and Universities is an edited attempt to describe curriculum for collegiate departments of religion. University Authority and the Student is an attempt to apply organizational theory to problems of governance in colleges and universities. The Courts and Higher Education indicates some of the changing legal interpretations of rights and responsibilities within colleges and universities. Financing Equal Opportunity in Higher Education examines means by which various minority groups can be brought in to higher education, while Campus Size seeks to establish optimum limits for various sorts of institutions. Students, Religion and the Contemporary University is reasonably faithful to its title as is Student Violence. Occupying a different point among the parameters is Information Services for Academic Administration which seeks ways of funneling more effective communications into the hands of those who must make decisions. Financing Medical Education and Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges add other dimensions to this burgeoning literature.

There is strong impressionistic evidence that both undergraduate and graduate students are expressing an intensified

demand for formal study in higher education. Testimony from various places around the country suggests that graduate programs in higher education are experiencing a somewhat higher application rate than are many of the more traditional academic fields. And institutions have begun to respond to this demand by the creating of formal curricular programs, or at least through appointing professors of higher education. Further, products of programs in higher education do enter administrative, quasi-administrative and scholarly ports.

Because of the rapid expansion of higher education as a field of study, the time has perhaps arrived for doing several things. First, the nature of higher education as a discipline should be explored by those active in the field, particularly if universities begin to prepare professional students of higher education. Secondly, the outlines of the field of higher education should be specified in considerably more detail than has been done to the present. And, thirdly, some discussion of types of program should be undertaken to provide institutions with assistance in deciding first of all whether or not to enter the activity, and if the decision is positive, what sorts of programs are feasible and potentially viable.

With respect to this last matter, at least three somewhat distinctive types of programs can be visualized, each pursuing a reasonable and respectable cluster of objectives, yet each requiring different approaches to staffing, funding and recruitment of students. The first type is an institution which supports its department or concentration in higher education in a quest to seek and maintain a national perspective. This sort of program would, as a general rule, seem to possess a number of characteristics. Generally, there will be from five to ten faculty members giving major attention to the study of higher education. (Lest this point be misunderstood, where such individuals are administratively lodged in a university is less important than the number and how the various individuals interact with each other. At the University of Michigan and the University of California, Berkeley, there are a number of full time professors lodged in the School of Education. At Stanford and the University of Minnesota there may be one or two professors lodged in the School of Education but other professors located in other departments or divisions who are also working in the same general domain). Generally this sort of program will emphasize doctoral level work, although some of the programs may also offer master's level work to students who have a particular need. Foreign students would be a good example, who will very likely move into educational leadership in their own country but for whom a master's degree would be ample formal preparation. Consistent with a national perspective, these institutions would seek to recruit students from all over the United States and from abroad and would similarly seek to place

graduates of the program over a widely dispersed geographic region. While graduates of these programs in higher education would undoubtedly find early placement in relatively minor positions, the aspirations of these programs would be to prepare people for leadership in the upper echelons, whether it be in institutions, higher educational bureaucracy, government, or organized philanthropy. It is almost axiomatic that in this kind of program the university would support the appointments in higher education on a hard money base as contrasted with appointments contingent on extramural funding. Further, a substantial number of appointments would be initially made at high academic rank to individuals who are well established as scholars in the field. For the most part this sort of program would be almost exclusively located in complex institutions possessing a rich variety of scholarly talent and an institutional willingness to marshal these riches for a sustained program. For this to happen, of course, it will be necessary that individuals holding appointment as professors of higher education should be generally regarded as intellectually the peers of senior professors in other divisions, departments and units of the university. It is through mutual regard that such desirable efforts as joint programs between higher education and a school of law, for example, can be mounted and sustained. Faculty members in the kind of program herein envisioned would be characterized by such phrases as "nationally recognized" "well published" or other statements indicative of a cosmopolitan orientation toward their professional practice. This is not to juxtapose cosmopolitan vs local concern, but it seems likely that if an institution wishes to recruit and place students nationally, its faculty should be nationally recognized. One would assume for example that faculty at institutions supporting this type of program would be found in disproportionately large numbers on various sorts of national committees and commissions studying higher education. In aggregate these various characteristics suggest that there would normally be only a limited number of programs (possibly 10-15) in the country.

A second type of program would be considerably smaller and considerably more local in the sort of student it intends to serve. This type could be exemplified as a small program offering formal instruction in higher education to junior administrators at the institution (for example, training student personnel workers for the residence hall program) and the administrators needed to staff junior colleges and other institutions in the immediate vicinity of the university. This sort of program also reflects several unique characteristics. There would be a small, full-time equivalent faculty, possibly no more than one or two at the most. There would be quite heavy use of part-time administrators who would offer practically oriented courses in their administrative specialties. The student body would possess a large proportion of part-time

students who were actually working at nearby institutions of higher education. The curriculum would also be severely limited and would be composed of, for the most part, courses oriented toward application. Very likely this sort of program would have neither extensive facilities nor great interest in developing strong research competencies in students. Rather the quest would be to develop on-the-job competencies through internships, apprenticeships or through didactic use of actual work experience. Since service to a limited geographic area would be a hallmark, the full-time faculty would be more preoccupied with intimate contact with nearby institutions than with a national reference group. Their consulting activities would be perhaps more systematic and sustained but in a limited number of institutions. The part-time faculty of local administrators would, of course, be preoccupied most of the time with their administrative duties. Because of the mission envisioned for this sort of institution, there probably should be many more programs than of the first sort. However, even these should be limited in numbers to perhaps not more than two or three such institutions in a state strategically located to facilitate the service role.

Nothing invidious is implied by the description of this second type of institution. Through internships (frequently arranged on campus), courses offered by active administrators, and courses in relevant theory by professors in and out of the School of Education would provide rich educational fare. However, the stress of the program would be on institutional or regional needs.

A third kind would possess a much less formal structure but would still seek limited but important objectives. A good example would be an institution which offered a limited number of courses on higher education needed or desired by individuals preparing for college teaching, especially in the junior colleges. Since this program would not be elaborately staffed, it would probably achieve maximum effectiveness by concentrating on preparing people for a single sort of career, e.g., junior college teaching or teaching in area vocational schools. A variant would be for a School of Education to maintain one or two faculty positions which would offer courses on college education and college teaching for doctoral students in other fields in that institution. Conceivably these (as would be true of more elaborate programs) could also teach something about the nature of higher education to undergraduates who seemingly since 1964 have been hungry for knowledge about higher education which could help them reform it. The faculty, for a program of this sort, would very likely come out of professional education, psychology or social psychology, for a major preoccupation would very likely be in the dynamics and methods of teaching and evaluation.

Since presumably programs of higher education of the first type will be most instrumental in establishing the parameters of

study and setting the general style of curricular development, research and service, a few other comments seem in order. Regardless of whether the program in higher education is concentrated or dispersed throughout a university, there should be a number of appointments of people who could be described as generalists and whose research would be largely synthesizing in character.

Institutions offering programs of the first type may or may not also support institutes or centers for research in higher education. However, it is important to differentiate between a department and an institute or center. A department is essentially the teaching operation with emphasis on the production of advanced graduate degrees plus the research and scholarship of its faculty. The center properly emphasizes research and development activities frequently supported by extra-mural contracts. There is no objection for people appointed primarily in a center to do some teaching for a department or for students and faculty in a department to do some research in a center. However, care should be exercised lest appointments become so entangled that the support of a department is contingent on maintenance on extra-mural contracts for the center. The departments, when constituted, will almost invariably be lodged administratively in a School of Education. In the past there have been attempts to lodge such departments elsewhere but these schemes have not materialized partly because the life of a teaching department is tied to the production of degrees which is a function of schools, the most relevant one of which would be the School of Education. What has been said concerning institutes or centers for the study of higher education could also be said with respect to other centers dealing with relevant matters such as a center for the study of the social and behavioral sciences. It would be well for there to be close relationships between the department of higher education and the center but not too close. And the department should never be reliant for its senior faculty members on extramural funding, whether managed by a department or by an outside institute.

Generally, in programs of the first type faculty appointments should be made from a number of different fields, however, with the clear expectation that a sociologist, economist or political scientist appointed to a department of higher education would serve as a professor of higher education, rather than serve as a professor of sociology or political science in education. This distinction is a fine one but highly important. One other caveat reiterates an earlier point that while departments of higher education should maintain some specialists, e.g., historian, political scientist, several of its senior faculty members should always be of the generalist student of higher education sort.

The foregoing typology suggests a static quality is not intended. It should be recognized that institutional concern for higher education can fluctuate over time with institutions shifting with respect to what type of program is to be supported. And there are institutions which desire to move in the opposite direction. Several imperatives should be mentioned. In some way or other a more sensitive barometer is needed to inform the public and the profession of shifts in program character. Secondly, for those institutions wishing to create type one kinds of programs, mechanisms are needed to inform the institution of full staffing and financial implications and to assist the institution by means of such techniques as visiting committees to assess potential strengths and weaknesses and to assist in planning. The entire thrust of this statement argues that the nation requires only a limited number of type one programs in higher education, but it does require those and that those which are created and maintained be well supported.

There is a present danger that over-proliferation of programs in higher education will produce an oversupply of people trained but not finding positions into which they can move. However, there is evidence that people prepared in well organized, staffed and financed programs are able to move into leadership positions with relative ease even at a time of tightening employment possibilities. This situation seems likely to persist.

REACTIONS TO PROGRAMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION*

Robert T. Alciatore
Professor of Higher Education
Oklahoma State University

It is difficult to take a position in opposition to Dr. Lewis Mayhew, as I was asked to do. Always insightful and logical, he was especially so today. I was particularly pleased to see the recognition that higher education programs serve diverse purposes.

The division into three types of programs which Dr. Mayhew suggests makes sense if we concentrate on the purposes served by the programs: one to prepare researchers and professors, one to prepare administrators, and one to prepare college teachers. Obviously some institutions can serve two or all three purposes. If, however, purposes are not the only distinguishing feature of the various programs but characteristics of faculty and students are also used as Dr. Mayhew suggests (he cited, you will recall, the geography--nationwide--from which students are recruited and where they can be placed, the number of faculty and their starting rank and salary as additional variables), then three categories would hardly seem adequate. Since practically all of these characteristics of students and faculty can be found in each of the three types of higher education programs divided according to purposes, perhaps to characterize programs along lines other than purposes may needlessly complicate our primary task.

There seemed in Dr. Mayhew's remarks to be an overstress on type one programs and by contrast a rather myopic view of the other two types. Type one programs will each have 5 to 10 faculty; the other two types will each have one or two faculty. Institutions attempting type one programs need to be informed of full staffing and financial implications, they will need visiting committees, the entire thrust being that the nation needs only a limited number of type one programs but these should be well supported.

Well, size of faculty always has and always will be primarily determined by the number of students in the program and funding will depend upon priorities. Some type three programs may require large faculties and receive good funding. For example, I would

---

*Reactions to the paper presented by Dr. Lewis B. Mayhew.

like to think that our program at Oklahoma State University can fulfill all three purposes, although primarily our program exists to provide a minor for future college teachers, then secondarily to prepare administrators, and only occasionally when the right students come along do we claim to produce the professor type. However, looking merely at the teacher training function, we must have done a convincing sales job for we are large. Around 100 students a year go through this program, and this requires more than one or two faculty. Regarding priorities, with the growth of the Doctor of Arts and other teaching degrees, with more and more colleges and universities stressing instructional improvement or quality teaching, we might expect as great a need and demand for quality faculty to supply the higher education minor or collateral field for future college teachers as Dr. Mayhew spoke about for the type one professor-researcher-administrator. This does not argue against the need to categorize but it does suggest a different purpose for doing so.

My next point in representing the loyal opposition is to express the fear that if we categorize programs according to the three types suggested, (the number is not important) we may give the impression that the best or only place to prepare the professor-researcher type is in one of the few, well-funded type-one programs. I would not want to give this impression. Some of the most productive people in this audience were not trained in type-one programs. They merely founded them. These people are productive, though, because the universities they attended screened for the best students and then taught them a methodology of scholarship and research which could be aimed at any level of education (higher, secondary, or elementary).

With this realization one may wonder if higher education is well served by categorizations. In my opinion rating studies with their halo criteria are less needed.

I honestly believe that instead of developing categories based on input variables (such as size of faculty, their rank, their visibility, and so forth), we could serve better a society which expects more and more that its organizations be accountable if we think in terms of output. In view of this, maybe our efforts should be along the lines of specifying the knowledges, skills, and attitudes that should be produced in someone who would function as a professor-researcher, as an administrator, and as a college teacher. Then programs could be evaluated and information supplied to all who are interested not according to the input of the institutions but according to the output of students. We may find that many of the graduates of developing institutions would outperform many of the graduates of the type one programs.

One point which Dr. Mayhew made cannot be denied, even by someone called upon to play the opposer's role, and this is the danger of overproducing graduates of higher education programs. A friend of mine once quipped that if medical schools had reamed out M.D.'s during the 60's as graduate schools reamed out Ph.D.'s, we could now get a heart transplant for a few hundred dollars. There is the danger of oversupply. The Modern Language Association has suggested not only a moratorium on all new programs but to enforce it a blacklisting of graduates of these new programs. However, overproliferation of programs may not be as great a cause of oversupply as the failure to define and enforce entrance requirements and the even greater failure to define, program for, and evaluate the achievement of exit requirements. Some of the largest, oldest, best funded (and one could add, some of the greatest beneficiaries of rating studies) have contributed to this problem as much as have younger programs and institutions. So my plea today would be to forget categorizing except according to purposes and to stress "output" rather than "input" variables in our study of higher education programs.

DEPARTMENTAL DEVELOPMENT: THE FORMATIVE USE OF NATIONAL GUIDELINES

John Bruce Francis
Assistant Professor of Higher Education
State University of New York at Buffalo

Of all the questions which can be raised in a discussion of national guidelines for departments of higher education--questions such as whether they should exist at all, who should develop them, what should be their nature and scope, and to what uses they should be put--perhaps the most controversial is that dealing with their use. For it is here that the burning question of departmental accreditation by the profession must be considered. If, however, accreditation is seen as the entire or even most important issue in the use of national guidelines, the profession risks overlooking certain highly valuable ways of employing those guidelines--not to mention the possibility of shying away from them entirely.

National guidelines have, in fact, a number of uses unrelated to accreditation. They can, for instance, be seen as the basis for a taxonomy of established and emerging higher education departments; or as categories for subdivisions of the Association of Professors of Higher Education (APHE). But these uses are peripheral to the major purpose in developing them, for one could certainly never justify spending much time discussing them if their only function were to serve only as categories.

Their primary use, it seems, is to serve as criteria for evaluation, as standards against which departments are assessed or assess themselves. Mention of evaluation will, of course, immediately revive the question of accreditation; and will probably engender some immediate negative reactions such as fear that guidelines will lead to unjust ranking of departments against an arbitrary status hierarchy. Such reactions, while understandable, emphasize only the abuses of the guidelines and overlook an important positive use of them--that of aiding a department to grow, develop, and attain its objectives through ongoing self-evaluation.

The contrast between using guidelines for purposes of accreditation and for purposes of development can be clarified by considering them as two distinct forms of evaluation requiring separate conceptual treatment. Theoretical notions introduced

by Scriven (1967)[1] form the basis for this distinction. He described two roles which evaluation could play in curriculum evaluation--roles which are analogous to those possible in evaluating departments. The first is called summative and refers to gathering observation-based information about a phenomenon, organizing it, and making it the basis of a terminal decision, a summary judgment about whether a program should continue, end, or be changed. This type of evaluation definitely implies accreditation and is subject to all the advantages and disadvantages of that process. Formative evaluation however--the second role described by Scriven[2]--is quite different. It too involves gathering observation-based information, but then immediately feeding it back to the group being assessed so that the group will know whether and to what extent its approaches and goals need to be modified. Formative evaluation by a department would consist ideally of (a) deciding upon its objectives, (b) of assessing and developing its strengths and weakness for pursuing those objectives, (c) of choosing the steps it needs to take to move toward its objectives, and (d) of assessing its progress toward those objectives and the sense of how appropriate they are in relation to how appropriate they were originally thought to be. Whether this process is carried out by members of the department being assessed or by a team of professionals acting as consultants is immaterial so long as the purpose is developmental change and the method is full and immediate feedback.

The Use of National Guidelines in Departmental Development

As noted above there are four aspects of formative departmental evaluation: choice of objectives, assessment of strengths and weaknesses, choice of development strategies, and on-going progress assessment. For each of these the national guidelines can assist by providing valuable information.

1. Choice of objectives. The first step in development for any department is a clear formulation of its objectives. Only in the light of its own chosen goals can a department make unbiased and accurate evaluations about itself or be fairly evaluated by others. One characteristic of the proposed national guidelines will be their role in categorizing the different objectives which higher education departments might have. There are, at first glance, three general kinds of objectives within which national guidelines can provide sub-categorizations and

---

1. Scriven, N. The Methodology of Evaluation. Perspective of Curriculum Evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

2. Ibid.

relationships. Departmental objectives might, for example, be oriented toward the study of particular issues of problem areas in higher education, such as administrative problems, or governmental planning. Or they might be oriented toward specific clienteles, as for example a departments' wishing to serve the professional advancement of teachers and administrators in surrounding community colleges and Liberal Arts colleges. A third type of objective might involve preparing students for certain kinds of careers such as college teachers or institutional researchers. The descriptive categorizations of possible departmental objectives which the national guidelines will include should assist departments in choosing appropriate, needed, and attainable objectives; in assessing the quality of those already chosen; and, if necessary, in developing new objectives to fit changed conditions.

A specific and often overlooked problem in choosing objectives which the guidelines can help alleviate concerns competition among neighboring higher education departments over the same or similar objectives. In the Northeast, for example, we at Buffalo have been considering the extent to which we ought to be aware of neighboring programs at Toronto, Syracuse, Albany, and even Michigan or Columbia. Should we choose our objectives in the light of what we perceive theirs to be? This may well be important because the context in which we all operate demands that we fulfill many different needs; and knowing their goals could help us choose ours. The development and spread of national guidelines can assist us and departments in other areas to avoid dysfunctional competition for the same students, faculty, and finances while at the same time helping assure that the region's needs are met.

2. Assessment of Departmental strengths and weaknesses. Having chosen its objectives, a department will then set out to determine just which aspects of its program can assist in attaining them and which aspects may serve as hindrances. Often, of course, the choice of objectives, will be influenced by known strengths and weaknesses; but for emerging and developing departments such a posture is to be avoided. Rather should objectives be chosen for their appropriateness; and vigorous efforts made to discover and eradicate weaknesses while capitalizing on and extending strengths. National guidelines can assist in this process by providing descriptions of different faculty, student and institutional resources which are both minimal and optimal for different objectives.

If, for instance, a department chooses to move toward the preparation of college teachers then careful assessment should be made of whether or not its faculty have adequate background, interest, and expertise for providing that kind of training. A faculty strong in research skills or administrative experience--two very common patterns in departments of higher education--

may not be the strongest kind of faculty for adequately pursuing the tasks of teacher preparation. Similarly, departments must assess the quality of their students in relation to departmental objectives. Departments whose students are largely part-time administrators can find this a great strength if their orientation is to practical up-grading of administrative skills; but for departments whose objectives are more theoretical--for instance to study the history and philosophy of higher education--such students may be a liability. Finally, departments must consider what institutional resources are available and whether these can be tapped for moving toward the department's objectives. Extent of library resources, adequacy of extra-mural funding, the availability of faculty in other disciplines with interests in higher education, and a central administration eager to attain national prominence--these are the strengths of a department whose aim is national status, but the weaknesses of departments which have chosen limited local objectives.

National guidelines specifying minimum resources, faculty orientations, and student characteristics appropriate to different departmental objectives can serve as a useful standard to departments engaged in assessing strengths and weaknesses.

3. Choice of development strategies. With a clear notion of where it wishes to go and of the resources it can and cannot muster to go there, the next step is for a department to decide which approaches it can take to upgrade its weaknesses and make use of its strengths. Decisions will need to be made about whether or not to recruit new faculty, whether or not these should be persons of same or different backgrounds, whether more or less teaching (or research) should be encouraged on the part of present faculty, and whether or not more professional affiliations should be sought. Regarding students, decisions need to be made about admissions policies, recruitment strategies, what kinds of courses should be offered, and whether special training programs such as administrative or teaching internships should be encouraged or required. Furthermore, approaches to the internal administration and/or external funding agencies may need to be made to gain the resources necessary to pursue an objective. Guidelines can aid this process in two ways. First, by cataloguing the different programs by objective within and in proximity to a certain area, the guidelines will give departments information with which they can argue for funds to fill some local or regional gap. If, for instance, many community colleges in a region are in need of qualified teachers, and a review of programs in the area shows none oriented to meet this need, i.e., none whose objectives match the relevant national guidelines for such programs, a strong argument can be mounted for funds to allow a department to meet that need.

A second, more general way the national guidelines can assist departments in devising strategies for development is by

providing a descriptive record of what other departments have already done to achieve their objectives. The guidelines can be seen as maps or as records of the experiences of others in the profession, chronicling the successful and unsuccessful strategies which have been used, and guiding similar departments toward effective strategies and away from ineffective ones.

4. On-going progress assessment. The essence of formative or developmental evaluation is continual or at least frequent assessments of progress toward chosen objectives. At the very least, departments of higher education should take periodic stock, subjecting objectives, resources, and development strategies to close scrutiny. From time to time, such assessments could be supplemented by visits from members of the higher education profession such as the panel which visited us at Buffalo. The emphasis in these visits should be, as it was for us, on direct and constructive feedback about stated objectives, the resources available with which to pursue them, and the practices being followed which seemed functional as well as the practices which seemed dysfunctional in attaining those objectives.

National guidelines can serve as criteria and as milestones for assessing the appropriateness of the objectives, the importance to the objectives of different departmental strengths and weaknesses, and the relevance to fulfilling the objectives of current and/or anticipated departmental practices. It should be emphasized--lest some be disturbed by the spectre of APHE experts descending upon departments of higher education armed with "National Guidelines" to whip them with--that (a) the purpose of on-going formative evaluation is feedback, not judgment, (b) most such evaluations will be done internally by the members themselves of departments with outside panels serving infrequently--by invitation--and only as consultants, and (c) that if guidelines are established, they will not be imposed by some mysterious "on-high" but will grow out of the needs, experiences, and deliberations of all APHE members.

Summary and Conclusions

National guidelines can be, but most definitely need not be, the source of abuse--of the establishment by our profession of a rigid hierarchy of departments and of an elite clique of inward-looking intellectual chauvinists. They need not even be used as the basis for accreditation decisions by professional agencies, governments, or institutions. Their primary role should be--because it is their most constructive role--formative. National guidelines fill this role by providing information with which departments themselves can select their objectives, analyze strengths and weaknesses, devise development strategies, and assess progress toward the objectives chosen.

Seeing national guidelines in this light leads to suggestions about their characteristics and the steps to be followed in devising them. It is with these that this paper concludes:

1. National guidelines should comprise categories of different objectives which departments of higher education can pursue. Such categories should be extensive but neither exhaustive nor exclusive, and should be continually open to modification.

2. National guidelines should discuss the minimal requirements of faculty, student, and institutional resources necessary for achieving different objectives. The emphasis here should be on discussion of minimum requirements rather than setting of such requirements and due account should be taken of departmental differences by the use of flexible ranges for such minima rather than fixed rules.

3. National guidelines should chronicle the development of both successful and unsuccessful programs, with careful analysis of the factors and strategies which make for success and failure in each instance.

4. National guidelines should discuss a schedule for internal evaluations by departments of higher education and should suggest different approaches to the assessment process, to decision-making for internal change, and to techniques of feeding back evaluation information quickly and completely. Suggestions should also be considered regarding feasible and non-threatening means of reporting the methods used in such evaluations to other members of the profession so that all evaluation techniques can constantly be upgraded.

5. Every effort should be made to keep the national guidelines descriptive rather than prescriptive.

6. Members of the Association of Professors of Higher Educations (APHE) should take responsibility for developing and maintaining the guidelines and for developing the necessary expertise to serve as consultants to each other in using them as aids to assessment.

7. Finally--and not surprisingly--if the APHE decides that the notion of establishing national guidelines is worthwhile and feasible, a committee should be formed to develop the idea, extend and clarify the guidelines proposed today, gather from other APHE members their ideas about the nature and use of the guidelines, and report formally to the Association its findings before next year.